

**Income Maintenance Advisory Committee
Department of Health and Family Services
Division of Health Care Financing
May 15, 2003
*Minutes***

County Attendees: **Ed Kamin**, Co-Chair, Kenosha Co. DHS; **Shirley Ross**, LaCrosse Co.; **Jackie Bennett**, Racine Co. HSD; **Liz Green**, Dane Co. DHS; **John Rathman**, Outagamie Co.; **Sheryl Siegl**, Winnebago Co. DHS; **Sue Schmitz**, Waukesha Co.; **Joanne Faber**, Washington Co.; **Connie Hendries**, Manitowoc Co.; **Jane Huebsch**, Marathon Co.; **Michael Poma**, Milwaukee Co.; **Felice Riley**, Milwaukee Co.; **Gloria Guitan**, Milwaukee Co.; **Sheila Drays**, Dodge Co.; **Shirley Kitchen**, Dodge Co.; **Terri Rapp**, Wood Co.

State Attendees: **Susan Wood**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Cheryl McIlquham**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Jim Jones**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Rick Zynda**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Jodi Ross**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Sara Pynenberg**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Scott Riedasch**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Bernadette Connolly**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Brian Fangmeier**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Essie Herron**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA, Milwaukee Region; **Joanne Simpson**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Jayne Wanless**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **John Haine**, DHFS/DHCF/BIMA; **Theresa Fosbinder**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Amy Mendel-Clemens**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Lisa Hanson**, DHFS/DHCF/BHCE; **Bob Martin**, DHFS/DMT;

WAPAF: **Rich Basiliere**, Outagamie Co; **Gene Kucharski**, Portage Co.

Administrative Items:

The minutes from the April meeting were approved for posting.

A survey will be sent out from DHFS to the IM agencies. The survey will address: The agency's hours of operation, agency and outstation address, and other basic information about IM agencies.

The MER visits will continue. There was a clarification that some of the policy related questions were added to the MER because the USDA has asked us to assess Farm Bill Implementation.

There will be an Administrator's Memo on IMAC coming out soon. There is also a project in the works to recreate the official Member list for IMAC.

The last Administrative item was the announcement of a new page to the Eligibility website.

Budget Proposal on IM Funding Update:

The Alternative Budget plan was sent to the Joint Finance Committee (JFC), see paper 405 on the JFC website. The JFC approved the alternative proposal that was endorsed by WCHSA, with two modifications. First, they approved a 4% rate increase instead of the 5% in the alternative. Second, the JFC approved additional funding of approximately \$2.4 million all funds. The GPR is to come from a DHFS state Administration allocation. DHFS will be assessing the impact of this action on State Operations. A summary was provided (see attached). DHFS is working on the formula for allocating funds and intends to issue preliminary allocations at the end of May in an Administrator's Memo. DHFS goals in setting up the formula for 2004 are to assure equity across agencies of all size and to minimize the impact of the cut in funding. The preliminary allocations will include base funding for the smallest agencies (under 500 cases). Remaining funding will be distributed based on caseload. A hold harmless will be implemented so no agency will receive a reduction of more than 16% compared to 2003. The preliminary allocations will be based only on JFC action, and may change.

Family Planning Waiver:

See attached handout for participation numbers. There is also a letter to providers being drafted, regarding the statutory requirements of this program.

Subcommittee Reports:

Quality Assurance:

Enclosed you will find recommendations to IMAC from the Quality Assurance Sub-committee that deal with performance standards for the 2004 IM contract. The performance standards focus on Food Stamp payment accuracy, case processing timeliness and caseload growth. Any comments on the recommendations should be sent to one of the co-chairs, John Haine at hainejj@dhfs.state.wi.us who will share them with the sub-committee and IMAC. See attached handout.

W2/C&I:

Will be meeting Friday May 16, 2003. One item on the agenda is to clarify funding for Child Care.

MA Transportation Ad Hoc:

See attached handout.

Update on FS Reduction Reporting:

See attached summary.

Handouts:

| <u>Total GPR Savings</u> | | |
|---|----------------|-----------------|
| SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| \$ (3,459,095) | \$ (6,686,176) | \$ (10,145,271) |
| <u>GPR Savings in Original Proposal</u> | | |
| SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| \$ (3,322,730) | \$ (6,464,172) | \$ (9,786,902) |
| <u>Difference</u> | | |
| SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| \$ (136,365) | \$ (222,004) | \$ (358,369) |

| <u>Summary of Change to County</u> | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | CY 04 | CY 05 |
| <u>Base</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ 28,681,265 | \$ 28,681,265 |
| AF | \$ 57,362,530 | \$ 57,362,530 |
| <u>FED Re-estimate</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ (1,193,234) | \$ (1,187,840) |
| AF | \$ - | \$ - |
| <u>Workload & Change Center</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ (5,308,130) | \$ (7,187,957) |
| AF | \$ (11,020,879) | \$ (14,904,720) |
| <u>Subtotal</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ 22,179,901 | \$ 20,305,468 |
| AF | \$ 46,341,651 | \$ 42,457,810 |
| <u>4% Rate Increase</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ 887,196 | \$ 812,219 |
| AF | \$ 1,853,666 | \$ 1,698,312 |
| <u>Add Lump Sum Funding</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ 1,217,100 | \$ 1,212,400 |
| AF | \$ 2,434,200 | \$ 2,424,800 |
| <u>New Base</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ 24,284,197 | \$ 22,330,086 |
| AF | \$ 50,629,517 | \$ 46,580,922 |
| <u>Total Difference</u> | | |
| GPR | \$ (4,397,068) | \$ (6,351,179) |
| AF | \$ (6,733,013) | \$ (10,781,608) |
| | -11.74% | -18.80% |

| <u>Reductions</u> | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | CY 04 | CY 05 | SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| <u>Re-estimate of Federal Funding</u> | | | | | |
| GPR | \$ (1,193,234) | \$ (1,187,840) | \$ (1,198,628) | \$ (1,187,840) | \$ (2,386,468) |
| FED | \$ 1,193,234 | \$ 1,187,840 | \$ 1,198,628 | \$ 1,187,840 | \$ 2,386,468 |
| AF | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| <u>Workload</u> | | | | | |
| GPR | \$ (4,982,453) | \$ (6,857,148) | \$ (2,491,226) | \$ (5,919,800) | \$ (8,411,026) |
| FED | \$ (5,361,343) | \$ (7,356,948) | \$ (2,680,672) | \$ (6,359,145) | \$ (9,039,817) |
| AF | \$ (10,343,796) | \$ (14,214,095) | \$ (5,171,898) | \$ (12,278,946) | \$ (17,450,843) |
| <u>Change Center</u> | | | | | |
| GPR | \$ (325,677) | \$ (330,809) | \$ (162,839) | \$ (328,243) | \$ (491,082) |
| FED | \$ (351,406) | \$ (359,816) | \$ (175,703) | \$ (355,611) | \$ (531,314) |
| AF | \$ (677,083) | \$ (690,625) | \$ (338,542) | \$ (683,854) | \$ (1,022,396) |
| <u>Subtotal</u> | | | | | |
| GPR | \$ (6,501,364) | \$ (8,375,797) | \$ (3,852,693) | \$ (7,435,884) | \$ (11,288,576) |
| FED | \$ (4,519,515) | \$ (6,528,923) | \$ (1,657,747) | \$ (5,526,916) | \$ (7,184,663) |
| AF | \$ (11,020,879) | \$ (14,904,720) | \$ (5,510,440) | \$ (12,962,800) | \$ (18,473,239) |
| <u>Rate Increase</u> | | | | | |
| | CY 04 | CY 05 | SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| GPR | \$ 887,196 | \$ 812,219 | \$ 443,598 | \$ 849,707 | \$ 1,293,305 |
| FED | \$ 966,470 | \$ 886,094 | \$ 483,235 | \$ 926,282 | \$ 1,409,517 |
| AF | \$ 1,853,666 | \$ 1,698,312 | \$ 926,833 | \$ 1,775,989 | \$ 2,702,822 |
| <u>Add Lump Sum Funding</u> | | | | | |
| | CY 04 | CY 05 | SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| GPR | \$ 1,217,100 | \$ 1,212,400 | \$ 608,550 | \$ 1,214,750 | \$ 1,823,300 |
| FED | \$ 1,217,100 | \$ 1,212,400 | \$ 608,550 | \$ 1,214,750 | \$ 1,823,300 |
| AF | \$ 2,434,200 | \$ 2,424,800 | \$ 1,217,100 | \$ 2,429,500 | \$ 3,646,600 |
| <u>Subtotal w/ Rate Increase and Lump Sum</u> | | | | | |
| GPR | \$ (4,397,068) | \$ (6,351,179) | \$ (2,800,545) | \$ (5,371,426) | \$ (8,171,971) |
| FED | \$ (2,335,945) | \$ (4,430,429) | \$ (565,962) | \$ (3,385,884) | \$ (3,951,846) |
| AF | \$ (6,733,013) | \$ (10,781,608) | \$ (3,366,507) | \$ (8,757,310) | \$ (12,123,817) |
| <u>State Operations Savings (includes MA Contracts cut)</u> | | | | | |
| | CY 04 | CY 05 | SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| GPR | \$ (1,317,100) | \$ (1,312,400) | \$ (658,550) | \$ (1,314,750) | \$ (1,973,300) |
| FED | \$ (1,317,100) | \$ (1,312,400) | \$ (658,550) | \$ (1,314,750) | \$ (1,973,300) |
| AF | \$ (2,634,200) | \$ (2,624,800) | \$ (1,317,100) | \$ (2,629,500) | \$ (3,946,600) |
| <u>Total Savings</u> | | | | | |
| | CY 04 | CY 05 | SFY 04 | SFY 05 | Biennial |
| GPR | \$ (5,714,168) | \$ (7,663,579) | \$ (3,459,095) | \$ (6,686,176) | \$ (10,145,271) |
| FED | \$ (3,653,045) | \$ (5,742,829) | \$ (1,224,512) | \$ (4,700,634) | \$ (5,925,146) |
| AF | \$ (9,367,213) | \$ (13,406,408) | \$ (4,683,607) | \$ (11,386,810) | \$ (16,070,417) |

Family Planning Waiver Update

IMAC—May 15, 2003

1. FPW Enrollment Statistics

- As of the end of April there were nearly **17,000** women enrolled in the FPW.
- That's up about **4,000** since the end of March.

| Age | Number of Enrollees |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 15 years | 315 |
| 16 years | 777 |
| 17 years | 1,310 |
| Total minors | 2,402 |
| 18 years | 1,624 |
| 19 years | 1,924 |
| <u>Total teens</u> | 5,950 |
| 20-44 years | 10,906 |
| <u>Total all ages</u> | 16,856 |

2. Follow-Up Training for Qualified Providers

- Dry run to be held on May 28th; AHSI to conduct second statewide training during June.
- Training to cover PE and completing the MA/BC/FPW mail-in application form.

3. Suspension of Emergency Rule

- Joint Committee for Review of Administrative Rules voted 6-4, on April 30, 2003, to suspend emergency rules for the Family Planning Waiver.
- In essence, JCRAR questioned policy of not counting parental income for minors.
- “No parental income deeming” policy is mandated under the waiver and considered central to protecting the confidentiality of minors who wish to enroll in the program.
- Examples of states with similar policies: Florida, South Carolina and Washington. Minnesota’s waiver request would not count even the minor’s income (<21 years of age).
- Despite JCRAR’s action, the Department is legally required to continue to implement the Waiver.
- The 1997-99 Biennial Budget Act, created s. 49.45(24r), Stats., which requires the department to:
 - Request a waiver to conduct a family planning demonstration project and
 - Implement the waiver once approved.

| County/Tribe | Age Groups | | | Total |
|--------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 15-17 | 18-20 | 21-44 | |
| ADAMS | 16 | 25 | 39 | 80 |
| ASHLAND | 37 | 78 | 120 | 235 |
| BARRON | 34 | 120 | 124 | 278 |
| BAYFIELD | 13 | 34 | 49 | 96 |
| BROWN | 63 | 130 | 273 | 466 |
| BUFFALO | 1 | 5 | 10 | 16 |
| BURNETT | 14 | 34 | 63 | 111 |
| CALUMET | 3 | 6 | 15 | 24 |
| CHIPPEWA | 6 | 25 | 59 | 90 |
| CLARK | 44 | 54 | 62 | 160 |
| COLUMBIA | 19 | 38 | 56 | 113 |
| CRAWFORD | 11 | 19 | 29 | 59 |
| DANE | 44 | 226 | 545 | 815 |
| DODGE | 16 | 21 | 68 | 105 |
| DOOR | 26 | 38 | 91 | 155 |
| DOUGLAS | 52 | 122 | 112 | 286 |
| DUNN | 19 | 65 | 144 | 228 |
| EAU CLAIRE | 19 | 114 | 281 | 414 |
| FLORENCE | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| FOND DU LAC | 10 | 34 | 107 | 151 |
| FOREST | 19 | 28 | 32 | 79 |
| GRANT | 58 | 125 | 174 | 357 |
| GREEN | 8 | 11 | 44 | 63 |
| GREEN LAKE | 3 | 8 | 20 | 31 |
| IOWA | 14 | 12 | 23 | 49 |
| IRON | 6 | 24 | 36 | 66 |
| JACKSON | 15 | 19 | 24 | 58 |
| JEFFERSON | 27 | 47 | 72 | 146 |
| JUNEAU | 28 | 24 | 54 | 106 |
| KENOSHA | 135 | 247 | 293 | 675 |
| KEWAUNEE | 2 | 6 | 10 | 18 |
| LACROSSE | 87 | 292 | 439 | 818 |
| LAFAYETTE | 16 | 38 | 23 | 77 |
| LANGLADE | 32 | 50 | 109 | 191 |
| LINCOLN | 39 | 90 | 96 | 225 |
| MANITOWOC | 10 | 23 | 46 | 79 |
| MARATHON | 91 | 306 | 398 | 795 |
| MARINETTE | 52 | 49 | 106 | 207 |
| MARQUETTE | 4 | 7 | 17 | 28 |
| MILWAUKEE | 207 | 525 | 1435 | 2167 |
| MONROE | 31 | 51 | 52 | 134 |
| OCONTO | 19 | 61 | 43 | 123 |
| ONEIDA | 67 | 126 | 171 | 364 |
| OUTAGAMIE | 9 | 21 | 47 | 77 |
| OZAUKEE | 1 | 4 | 14 | 19 |
| PEPIN | 1 | 3 | 15 | 19 |
| PIERCE | 26 | 124 | 149 | 299 |
| POLK | 33 | 95 | 141 | 269 |
| PORTAGE | 72 | 192 | 353 | 617 |
| PRICE | 33 | 63 | 67 | 163 |
| RACINE | 157 | 255 | 371 | 783 |
| RICHLAND | 9 | 16 | 19 | 44 |
| ROCK | 144 | 194 | 306 | 644 |
| RUSK | 10 | 12 | 32 | 54 |
| ST. CROIX | 73 | 169 | 193 | 435 |
| SAUK | 13 | 34 | 116 | 163 |
| SAWYER | 25 | 43 | 96 | 164 |
| SHAWANO | 29 | 38 | 63 | 130 |
| SHEBOYGAN | 2 | 13 | 79 | 94 |
| TAYLOR | 26 | 51 | 87 | 164 |
| TREMPEALEAU | 23 | 43 | 27 | 93 |
| VERNON | 10 | 35 | 52 | 97 |
| VILAS | 28 | 34 | 44 | 106 |
| WALWORTH | 90 | 140 | 152 | 382 |
| WASHBURN | 35 | 60 | 60 | 155 |
| WASHINGTON | 6 | 33 | 78 | 117 |
| WAUKESHA | 75 | 131 | 137 | 343 |
| WAUPACA | 26 | 49 | 74 | 149 |
| WAUSHARA | 6 | 18 | 26 | 50 |
| WINNEBAGO | 7 | 39 | 164 | 210 |
| WOOD | 9 | 41 | 136 | 186 |
| MENOMINEE | 1 | 1 | 10 | 12 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RED CLIFF | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------|------|------|-------|
| STOCKBRIDGE | | | 3 | 3 |
| POTAWATOMI | | | 1 | 1 |
| LAC DU FLAMBEAU | | 1 | 14 | 15 |
| BAD RIVER | 0 | 0 | 13 | 13 |
| SOKAOGON | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| ONEIDA | 1 | 1 | 11 | 13 |
| UNKNOWN | 5 | 3 | 7 | 15 |
| STATE TOTALS | 2402 | 5314 | 9140 | 16856 |

Program Integrity

DRAFT June 9, 2003

The Department of Health and Family Services is committed to the effective administration of the Food Stamp and Medicaid/BadgerCare & SeniorCare programs. A fundamental component of program administration is the design, implementation and evaluation of policies, procedures and other measures to assure achievement of program goals.

DHFS goals for IM administration are to:

1. Assure timely and accurate eligibility and benefit determination.
2. Provide excellent customer service
3. Improve the health status of the people of Wisconsin
4. Increase federal revenue to benefit the state's economy
5. Operate programs efficiently.

DHFS is committed to working in partnership with local IM agencies to operate these programs in a fiscally responsible way, balancing funding and workload, to achieve these goals. This is a wide-ranging, constant and data-driven process intended to assure reliability in the IM programs.

In most discussions about program integrity the focus is on eligibility of people receiving assistance. The following chart maps the administrative measures that are in place to measure the eligibility-related aspects of program administration

| | | Provide excellent customer service | Operate programs efficiently | Assure timely and accurate eligibility and benefit determination |
|--|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Activities/functions and requirements that support program integrity goals | How this is handled and who has the responsibility | | | |
| 1. Policy Development to assure timely processing of applications, reviews and changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verification in general ▪ Front End Verification ▪ Frequency of reviews ▪ Change reporting – what and when ▪ Establishing claims to recover benefits issued in error ▪ Fraud investigation ▪ Benefit restoration ▪ Forms and publications to support these policies | Medicaid and FS policy sections set & publish policy based on federal and state requirements | x | x | x |
| 2. Systems support for these policies <u>CARES</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data exchange subsystem ▪ Alerts ▪ Prompts ▪ Notices ▪ Eligibility rules incorporated into the system software <u>CRES</u> system for tax intercept processing of claims | Systems support section Systems support section maintains existing systems and designs new ways to provide automated support to meet business requirements Managed by DWD Collections staff | x | x x x | x |
| Front-end verification & Fraud Prevention - agency plan requirements & funding | Managed by DHFS Public Assistance Fraud Section Local Agencies implement | | x | x |

| | | Provide excellent customer service | Operate programs efficiently | Assure timely and accurate eligibility and benefit determination |
|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Activities/functions and requirements that support program integrity goals | How this is handled and who has the responsibility | | | |
| | | | | |
| 3. Training and Technical Assistance provided by DHFS to local agencies | | | | |
| Customer education by means of publications & notices | Done through CARES notices and independent publications developed by policy staff and Communications Section | x | x | |
| Basic training on eligibility and how to apply for community-based agencies | Communications Section | x | x | |
| IM worker training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Worker Training Experienced Worker Training Management training | Communications Section working with DWD Training staff, UW-Oshkosh and training staff employed by county agencies IMAC Training & Technical Assistance Subcommittee created to advise DHFS on this | x | x | x |
| Technical assistance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Call Center PAC role Area Administration | Communications, Food Stamp and Program Evaluation Sections | x | x | x |
| | | | | |
| 4. Monitoring & Evaluation | | | | |
| Food Stamp QC | Program Evaluation Section through QC reviews | | x | x |
| MEQC Special projects | Program Evaluation Section through case reviews and customer surveys | x | x | x |
| Complaints | Communications Section | x | | x |
| Tracking of data on claims established and benefits recovered | BIMA collections and DWD | | x | x |
| Local agency feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IMAC & subcommittees WCHSA WSSA ANEW Other informal methods | Program Management Section | x | x | x |
| Recipient Hotline (includes SC) | Communications Section | x | | |
| Fair Hearings (including SC) | FS & MA Sections with Local Agencies, including CAPO | x | | x |
| Administrative Disqualification Hearings | FS & MA Sections with Local Agencies, including CAPO | | x | x |
| Management Evaluation Reviews of local agencies | Program Evaluation Section | x | x | x |
| State Agency Operations Review conducted by USDA on Food Stamp program | Program Evaluation Section with other sections as needed | x | x | x |
| Other monitoring of IM Contract Compliance | Program Evaluation and Program Management Section | x | x | x |
| | | | | |
| Management and oversight of Food Stamp Reinvestment Plans | Food Stamp Policy Section | | | x |
| Management and oversight of FS Payment Accuracy Master Plan | Food Stamp Policy Section | | | x |
| LEP Services | Communications, Program Evaluation Sections, AAAs and Local Agencies | x | | |
| Non-discrimination (ADA) & CRC | Communications, Program Evaluation Sections, AAAs and Local Agencies | | | x |

Quality Assurance Subcommittee

Performance Standards Recommendations to:

DHFS & IMAC

Charge

Develop performance standards recommendations for consideration by IMAC and DHFS for the 2004 IM contract. Standards identified for consideration are:

- Food Stamp payment accuracy, sanction and bonus
- Food Stamp denial/termination accuracy
- Food Stamp program participation
- Food Stamp application processing timeliness
- Food Stamp and Medicaid/BadgerCare benefit recovery (not contained in current set of recommendations, will be discussed at the June 16th QAS meeting)

Guiding Principles Established by the QA Subcommittee

- With one exception, only agencies selected in the Food Stamp QC sample are considered for either a bonus or a sanction pass-through
- If you share in the pain you share in the gain, all agencies selected in the sample share in the sanction (if responsible for the error) and share in the bonus (if responsible for the correct case)
- No Food Stamp sanction in 2004
- If there is no sanction or bonus to Wisconsin, there is no sanction or bonus pass-through to the local level

Background Information

Review of bonus pass-through information is contained in Chart 1. Sanction (APE) information is contained in Chart 2 using the new sanction method. Baseline data from FY 2001 and FY 2002 are used as examples for the recommendations.

Recommendations

1. **Only APE errors are counted in a sanction pass-through to the local agencies, not agency errors (non-APE). For example, Milwaukee County had several Food Stamp payment errors that were defined as agency (non-APE) errors due to documentation problems between the W-2 agency and Milwaukee County. Only APE errors will be part of the sanction.**
2. **Only agencies selected in the sample will be part of any sanction pass-through. Ten small agencies were not part of the FFY 2001 sample.**
3. **All local agencies with APE errors will assume liability for a sanction pass-through. Liability for sanctions is no longer restricted to local agencies with a QC sample of 30 or more cases selected in a program year. In FY 2001 five agencies had a sample of 30 or more cases.**
4. **In order to not place too much of a burden on agencies, especially small agencies, there is a maximum APE pass-through at a range between 3%-5% of the agencies budget.**
5. **The sanction pass-through liability is based on the specific APE dollars determined with QC data. No initial comparison is made to the federal tolerance level (ref. Chart 3). For example, using FY 2001 data and the new method of calculating the liability:**

- ABC County had four cases sampled with no APEs and a liability of \$0.
 - EFG County had APEs totaling \$133 and would have incurred a liability of \$7,049 ($\$133 \times \53 agency APE penalty). The APE multiplier is \$53.
 - HIJ County had APEs totaling \$43 and would have incurred a liability of \$2,279 ($\$43 \times \53 agency APE penalty). The APE multiplier is \$53.
6. Use a similar calculation applied to the dollars issued for the correct cases for each local agency selected in the sample to determine the agency's percentage of total dollars issued for correct cases. The agency would receive that percentage of the bonus pass-through. For example, using FY 2002 data for correct cases and a pass-through of \$1 million:
 - KLM County, with 5.6% of the correct case allotment total, would have received \$55,998
 - NOP County, with 1.37% of the correct case allotment total, would have received \$13,689
 - QRS County, with 45.39% of the correct case allotment total, would have received \$453,898
 7. DHFS will retain 50% of any bonus pass-through to implement statewide initiatives or offset state payment accuracy costs.
 8. IM contract language should contain broad earmarking language, e.g. "used to fund local agency resources necessary to the administration of IM programs." This would allow the bonus funds to be matched with federal \$.
 9. The same methodology (number of correct cases) would be applied to a bonus pass-through associated with Food Stamp negative error rate improvement. The state would retain 50% of bonus dollars earned. The pass-through formula would be applied to the remainder.
 10. Food Stamp participation bonuses have a different pass-through method. The state would retain 50% of bonus dollars earned, but the remainder would be passed-through to each local agency as a percentage of their caseload. Using FY 2001 caseload data and a pass-through of \$1 million:
 - TUV County, with .36% of the caseload, would receive \$3,628
 - WXY County, with 50.17% of the caseload, would receive \$501,698
 - ZZZ County, with 3.66% of the caseload, would receive \$36,618
 11. 100 percent of any bonus dollars earned in the timely processing of Food Stamp applications would be passed-through to the local agencies. Bonuses would be distributed based on individual local agency performance as demonstrated in QC data. Baseline data is starting with FY 2003 QC reviews.

Income Maintenance Advisory Committee
Committee Charter
MA Transportation Subcommittee

Purpose/Scope:

Created as an ad-hoc committee in 2003 by agreement the DHFS administrators and the WCHSA IM Technical Advisory Committee to assess options to modify MA transportation services and funding.

The priorities for this committee are:

1. The adequacy of MA transportation services and funding
2. Opportunities to modify the methods of providing MA transportation services and funding mechanisms
3. Other transportation issues, as identified by subcommittee members.

The goals for these activities are to:

- Improve MA transportation services;
- Improve efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of MA transportation services; and
- Ease workload for local agency workers

The sub-committee will make recommendations for project options and priorities to both DHFS and to WCHSA.

Membership and staffing responsibilities:

WCHSA names local agency representatives. The Division of Health Care Financing names state agency representatives.

Members:

- Bob Macaux, Florence County
- Liz Green, Dane County
- Joyce Decker, Winnebago County
- Barb Spaude, Outagamie County
- Susan Wood, BIMA Bureau Director, DHCF
- Joanne Simpson, Program Management Section Chief, DHCF
- Bernadette Connolly, Contract Specialist, DHCF
- Eileen McRae, DHCF
- Sue Torum, Jefferson County
- Deb Rathermel, Fond du Lac

- Tammy Pinno, Fond du Lac
- Liz Green, Dane

Staff support will be arranged and managed by DHCF.

Meeting Schedule:

Business will be conducted in meetings, conference calls and using e-mail. The co-chairs will develop the schedule.

Assignments, products and milestones:

Last updated 5/16/03

MA TRANSPORTATION AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE

Issues and Proposed Solutions

Minutes from Meeting, May 5, 2003

| Issue | Proposal | Pros | Cons | Comments |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1. Workload – | Propose to eliminate prior authorization for transportation services | | | |
| 2. Workload | Verify mileage through claims system | | a. Reimbursement delayed when claim is not submitted timely. This will increase calls and workload | |
| 3. Workload and adequacy of admin fee for counties. | Centralize the system – transportation broker option. So, authorization, verification and reimbursement is provided centrally. | | a. Transportation for MA takes the burden off volunteer vans which are then freed up to serve other people/demands for rides. If taken from county, this control is taken away too. b. Concern that providers will no longer work cooperatively with the county | Concern raised about family care counties. It is a risk-based system and transportation is part of the benefit package —providers at risk if they don't ensure it is provided. Also, need to be careful about what the authorization process might look like. |
| 4. Workload | SSI Recipients – budget proposal for HMO providers – include transportation in services | a. This would be a significant workload savings for local agencies. | | |
| 5. Inconsistent Policy and Workload – | Statewide guidance on who is eligible for transportation services | | | |
| 6. Inconsistent Policy – | Adopt a uniform policy on meal reimbursement | | | |
| 7. Inconsistent Policy | Statewide guidelines needed to clarify who, what where why when how. | | | May be beneficial to some counties but others may want more flexibility; Concern about what rules allow us to do. Need to be sensitive to concern about smaller counties and the need for some to travel further and/or more often than residents of larger areas in order to get quality health care. |
| 8. Adequacy of Reimbursement fee for counties | | | | |

Other items/comments:

1. We should consider bringing in MA providers – what guidelines do they need and how do they view any of the options?
2. The number of providers did not seem to be a major issue. Bigger transportation issues centered on getting to work, or getting discharged from the hospital on a Sunday.
3. A separate issue has arisen. Do the local agencies feel they need guidelines on a deadline to submit mileage records? One county has a client that has recently submitted bills that are 2-3 years old. We would like to allow flexibility, but it might be good to have a specific timeframe.
4. We should e-mail the IM agency directors to announce the ad hoc committee to ensure we have adequate representation and to communicate that we want input as well as representation from local agencies.

MA TRANSPORTATION AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE -May 5, 2003

Committee Members Present

Joanne Simpson- Co-chair, DHFS
Eileen McRae, DHFS
Barb Spaude, Outagamie
Deb Rathermel, Fond du Lac
Sara Shakelton for Liz Green, Dane

Bob Macaux – Co-chair, Florence County
Bernadette Connolly, DHFS
Sue Torum, Jefferson County
Tammy Pinno, Fond du Lac
Joyce Decker, Winnebago

FS Reduced Change Reporting Policy – Update for IMAC 05/15/03

- Tentative policy implementation date for Phase I is July 01, 2003
- Implementation date is dependent on FNS waiver approval
- Waiver request was submitted to the FNS national office on May 7th with a recommendation for approval from the regional office in Chicago
- Policy will be implemented statewide with a mass mailing to affected FS households
- Local agencies will receive an Operations Memo, a copy of the mass mailing that will be sent to affected FS households, and a power point presentation that will explain the policy change and background
- There is also a training program in development titled “Application Processing.” This interactive training will focus on the importance of correct case processing at application, change, and review. This will be crucial for the success of reduced change reporting requirements for FS recipients and reduction in the State FS error rate. We also want to reduce the risk of experiencing an increase in agency errors while reducing the client errors.